DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 249 343 CE 039 023

AUTHOR Bailis, Lawrence Neil
TITLE What's Happening to CBOs under JTPA and Where Do We Go from Here? Highlights of the NYEC Survey.
PUB DATE 5 Jun 84
NOTE 22p.; For related documents, see CE 039 024-025. Paper presented at the National Youth Employment Coalition Symposium on "Training Disadvantaged Youth--The Future Role of Community-Based Organizations" (New York, NY, June 5, 1984).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adolescents; *Agency Role; *Community Action; Community Cooperation; Community Organizations; Community Programs; *Disadvantaged Youth; Employment Problems; *Employment Programs; Federal Legislation; Federal Programs; Government Role; Job Training; *Program Attitudes; Program Effectiveness; Public Agencies; Young Adults; *Youth Employment
IDENTIFIERS *Job Training Partnership Act 1982

ABSTRACT

This paper summarizes the results of a National Youth Employment Coalition (NYEC) survey of community-based organizations (CBOs) about the effects of the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA). Findings are summarized in these areas: (1) changes in funding for training disadvantaged youth, (2) changes in service to youth, (3) the role of CBOs in the JTPA delivery system, and (4) problems facing CBOs. In the first area, the survey found that the average funding for CBOs decreased by 58 percent and the average funding for CBO efforts to provide employment and training for disadvantaged youth decreased by 35 percent under JTPA. In the second area, 40 percent of CBOs served fewer out-of-school youth, 31 percent served fewer Black youth, and 35 percent served fewer Hispanic youth than they had served under the old Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) funding. The role of CBOs in the JTPA delivery system has decreased. One-third fewer CBOs are serving on Private Industry Councils than served on the former Prime Sponsor Advisory Councils, and many CBOs did not apply for JTPA funding since they thought they could not qualify. Finally, the biggest problems facing CBOs today include limitations on administrative funds, elimination of stipends, meeting performance standards while serving large numbers of disadvantaged youth, cash flow, obtaining or operating performance-based contracts, and difficulty in getting information about plans and requirements. However, some CBOs have survived and prospered, and they should serve as models for the changes needed by others. At the same time, CBOs should work together for needed changes in the JTPA and its regulations. (KC)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED249343

# WHAT'S HAPPENING TO CBOs UNDER JTPA

# AND WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

# HIGHLIGHTS OF THE NYEC SURVEY

June 5, 1984

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

K Nochimson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Prepared for:

National Youth Employment Coalition
Symposium on Training Disadvantaged Youth
and the Future Role of CBOs

Prepared by:

Lawrence Neil Bailis
70 Leicester Road
Belmont, Massachusetts 02178

CE 039033

SELECTED FINDINGS

FROM THE

NATIONAL YOUTH EMPLOYMENT COALITION

SURVEY OF COMMUNITY BASED ORGANIZATIONS

## CHANGES IN FUNDING FOR TRAINING DISADVANTAGED YOUTH

Between 1980 and 1984:

- The average funding for community based organizations (CBOs) from CETA/JTPA decreased by 58%

  --Roughly one in four CBOs lost all CETA/JTPA funding

- The average funding for CBO efforts to provide employment and training for disadvantaged youth decreased by 35%

  --Roughly one in five CBOs lost all employment and training funding

If one takes the 34.3% increase in the cost of living between 1980 and 1984, the drop in funding for CBOs is that much more severe.

Roughly 43% of CBOs were unable to tap <u>any</u> new sources of revenue to make up for cutbacks they were experiencing.

## CHANGES IN SERVICE TO YOUTH

Between 1980 and 1984:

- 40% of CBOs served fewer out-of-school youth
  --23% served 50% fewer out-of-school youth
- 31% served fewer Black youth
  --17% served 50% fewer Black youth
- 35% served fewer Hispanic youth
  --17% served 50% fewer Hispanic youth

Nearly half of the CBOs believe that their SDAs are giving a lower priority to serving disadvantaged and out-of-school youth than CETA Prime Sponsors had done in the past.

Nearly half of the CBOs report that JTPA performance standards are forcing them to serve people with more skills and with fewer barriers to employment than they would prefer to serve.

## ROLE OF CBOs IN THE JTPA DELIVERY SYSTEM

One-third fewer CBOs are serving on Private Industry Councils than served on the former Prime Sponsor Advisory Councils.

One quarter of the CBOs that received CETA funding did not apply for JTPA funds

- A quarter of them thought that they did not have a chance to be funded.

## PROBLEMS FACING CBOs

The biggest problems facing CBOs today include:

- Limitations on administrative monies (78%)
- Elimination of stipends (60%)
- Meeting SDA performance standards while serving large numbers of disadvantaged youth (55%)
- Cash flow (50%)
- Obtaining or operating performance-based contracts (40%)
- Difficulty in getting information about SDA plans and requirements (35%)

More than 40% of CBOs report that cutbacks in technical assistance that they receive have had a moderate or a severe impact on their ability to compete for funds under JTPA.

# WHAT'S HAPPENING TO CBOs UNDER JTPA

# AND WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

# HIGHLIGHTS OF THE NYEC SURVEY*

## Introduction

It may seem strange to have a researcher come and attempt to tell you all what is happening to community based organizations today. Each of you presumably knows alot about that already--if you didn't you wouldn't be here.

So what do I have to offer? The perspective that that distance brings, and the ability to summarize the perceptions of hundreds of CBOs in order to help each of your to put your own perceptions and judgment into a wider framework.

In the next few minutes, I am going to summarize the results of a survey conducted by the National Youth Employment Coalition. But before I do, I want to thank all of you in the audience for assisting in the design and administration of the questionnaire, and for cajoling your colleagues to complete the forms and to get them in on time.

---

* This paper summarizes the results of a survey of community based organizations conducted by the National Youth Employment Coalition under the general oversight of Ken Nochimson with funding from the Ford Foundation. The questionnaire was developed in consultation with the membership of the Coalition. Further information about the survey and its results are available from Ken Nochimson.

An earlier draft of this paper was reviewed by Larry Brown, Andrew Hahn, Ken Nochimson, and Alan Zuckerman. Despite their assistance and the help of many others, responsibility for the content of this paper remains solely with the author, and not either the sponsoring or funding agencies.

Questionnaires were mailed to roughly 1000 community based organizations that are affiliated with the National Youth Employment Coalition or whose names were given to us by national employment and training organization that are not yet affiliated. Three hundred fourteen (314) of them were received in time to be tabulated for this conference, and more of them continue to be received.

But in any event, we have a one in three sample in what I believe is the largest single survey of community based employment and training organizations in history.

In the course of making presentations to the leadership of human service organizations, I have discovered that--for some reason--people are less than enthralled by the prospect of listening to dozens and dozens and dozens of statistics. Therefore, I will be presenting the highlights of the survey in a simple question and answer format with a minimum of statistics, and have prepared a more statistical paper with charts, tables, and statistics for those of you who want to see the numbers that provide backup for the conclusions that I am presenting today.

I hope that the results of the survey will be useful to you today in reaching a consensus about what is happening to CBOs and their clients, and even more importantly, in guiding your deliberations in trying to figure out what steps need to be taken to maintain and strengthen the role of community based organizations as unique resources in meeting the employment and training needs of disadvantaged youth.

(1) Who responded to the survey questionnaire?

In the fall of 1983, the leadership of the National Youth Employment Coalition and I worked together to develop a questionnaire that addressed the major concerns of its member organizations. The questionnaire was mailed out in January, 1984, and by the end of March, we had 314 responses from community based organizations from across the country.

Altogether, we have responses from a wide variety of groups. Our respondents represent:

- 45 states and the District of Columbia
- Large CBOs and small ones, including one with a budget of $ 29,000,000 and eight that currently have no funding whatsoever
- Affiliates of large national CBOs as well as more than a hundred local unaffiliated CBOs

- 75 CBOs that provide employment and training services exclusively and 226 multiservice organizations

- 72 CBOs that serve youth exclusively, and 230 that serve youth and adults

- Roughly eight out of every nine respondents had been the recipients of CETA monies--but, as we shall see, the proportion of JTPA grantees is smaller

- Finally, our responses came from agencies of widely varying ages:

  --About two-thirds were created after 1964, presumably responding to forces that were set in motion by the passage of the Economic Opportunity Act, and the redirection of MDTA. As such they represent the development of an alternative network of agencies, created to help fill the gaps in the traditional system of youth serving agencies that includes public schools and private non-profit voluntary associations.

  --The remaining one-third are representative of these pre-existing organizations such as the Girls Clubs and National Urban League that had made contributions in the past and that continue to do so today.

Most importantly, our respondents are organizations that are still in existence. In assessing the results of the survey, listeners should keep in mind that discussions about the impact of cutbacks obviously exclude responses from the large numbers of nationally affiliated and independent CBOs that have been totally wiped out by the cutbacks in recent years. The fact that we could not contact such groups means that all of the results in this paper <u>understate</u> the degree to which cutbacks have occurred.

(2) What services are CBOs providing today?

Our survey confirms that--with the single major exception of work experience--the community based organizations that are still in the manpower business are still providing the kinds of services that they have been best known for in the past.

First, and foremost, community based organizations are providing counselling and other supportive services to disadvantaged adults and youth. More CBOs are currently delivering these services than any others.

And as we will no doubt be discussing all day, the limitations in funding for supportive services in JTPA are therefore presenting a major threat to the attractiveness of serving those who require supportive services to SDAs, and thus to the viability of CBOs and the ability of CBOs and others to meet the employment and training needs of disadvantaged youth.

The second most frequently delivered services are job development, job placement, or job search assistance. These areas remain central to employment and training, and--if anything--are receiving increased emphasis under JTPA. It is therefore vital that CBOs be in a position to demonstrate that they can provide such services to disadvantaged youth in an exemplary manner.

Outreach and assessment are the responsibilities that CBOs carry out the third most frequently. CBOs can rightly claim to have pioneered the concept of outreach to disadvantaged adults and youth who are not being served by mainstream organizations, and are widely regarded as having a comparative advantage in this area.

It is, however, by no means obvious that SDAs feel a great need to engage in extensive outreach to disadvantaged adults or youth at this time. Therefore, the future for CBOs in outreach and assessment may well rest on the priority to which SDAs can be persuaded--or forced--to attach to these functions.

The fourth most frequently encountered function being carried out by CBOs today is classroom skills training. This is an area of extreme importance under the Job Training Partnership Act, and is perhaps the function that is being most heatedly competed for among skills centers, vocational schools, community colleges, proprietary schools, private for profit firms, and CBOs. CBOs have to demonstrate that they can provide classroom skills training to disadvantaged youth more cost-effectively than the other contenders for this function.

As might be expected, more than half of the CBOs that once provided year round work experience--for either in school or out of school youth--are no longer doing so. These changes may be less of a reflection on the CBOs involved than the legislative limitations on this component under JTPA.

As public policy turns its back on the provision of work experience services that were useful for many disadvantaged youth, the CBOs who are acknowledged specialists in this field have been paying the price.

The survey also shows a cutback in the numbers of CBOs providing other critical employment and training services. More than a quarter of the CBOs that once provided remedial education services are no longer doing so; more than a third of the agencies that were responsible for on the job training (OJT) have withdrawn from--or been forced to abandon--this activity.

Finally, it is reassuring to see that the survey shows that there are substantial numbers of CBOs that are still providing comprehensive employment and training services--in other words, everything from intake to placement. Persuasive arguments have been made that CBOs are at their most effective when they are permitted to serve the "whole person", but unfortunately these arguments have not always been successful in persuading the leadership of Prime Sponsors and SDAs. Thus the proportion of agencies providing this function continues to decline.

So far, this is a rather familiar picture.

Let's take a look at how things have been changing.

(3) What's been happening to CBOs in the past four years?

How have things changed for CBOs since 1980 when the initials CETA, YEDPA, and PSE stood for multi-billion dollar programs that were meeting the needs of hundreds of thousands of disadvantaged Americans?

The overall answers to this question will probably not surprise you very much. Our survey shows that:

- CBOs have less funding overall,
- CBOs have considerably less funding for employment and training programs,
- Support for employment and training programs from government sources has been cut drastically, and
- Thus, the number of staff available to provide employment and training services has also declined precipitously.

Let me break my promise for a minute, and give you some statistics:

- Despite considerable increases in the cost of providing services in the past four years, the <u>total budget</u> for the typical CBO that responded to our survey in 1984 was only about 95% of the funding that was available in 1980.
- The total <u>employment and training budget</u> for the typical CBO in 1984 only 55% of the funding that was available in 1980.

- The total employment and training funds provided by JTPA represent only 42% of the funds that were received from CETA in 1980.

- The total number of agency staff responsible for training disadvantaged youth has declined to 59% of the levels in 1980 in the typical CBO respondent to our survey.

In other words, the cutbacks in funding were considerably more severe for employment and training activities than they were for community based organizations as a whole, and the cutbacks in CETA and JTPA were even more severe than the total cutbacks in funding for employment and training from all sources.

If these figures surprise you at all, it is probably because they are less drastic than you would have expected. The explanation for these findings is that they mask the fact that some CBOs are doing much better than average, and others are doing much worse.

As we all know, the crisis in unemployment among disadvantaged youth is hidden within the broader picture of an overall decline in unemployment. Similarly, the crises faced by CBOs created since 1964 primarily to serve the unemployment needs of disadvantaged youth are considerably more severe than those faced by the average survey respondent.

For example, I just said that the average CBO had approximately 95% of the funding in 1984 than it did in 1980. This figure is based in part in a 50% growth in funding in the more traditional CBOs that were in existence before the War on Poverty, and a 35% decrease in total funding for the newer CBOs.

Even more strikingly, those organizations that have specialized in meeting the employment and training needs of disadvantaged Americans and those that have been most dependent on government funds have suffered the most. Many of these CBOs have totally lost their government funding and others have been cut back sharply.

If you will bear with me, a few statistics help to make this point more graphically:

- Only two thirds of the CBOs that had gotten support from CETA are now in receipt of grants from JTPA; one out of three have fallen by the way side.

- The typical OIC survey respondent now has an overall budget which is only 40% of what it was only four years ago.

(4) What is happening to the clients of CBOs that are being cut back?

There is no evidence that anyone is filling the gap. Our survey shows that fewer than one in four CBOs was able to point to any other public or private agencies that were serving increased numbers of disadvantaged youth who could no longer be helped due to cutbacks in funding for CBOs. More than half reported that no other organizations were picking up the slack and thus fewer youth were being served. Roughly a quarter indicated that they didn't know whether anyone else was able to do so or not.

Of those who were able to list other groups, the largest number cited school systems and the next largest cited other CBOs. Private businesses and SDAs themselves were cited the least often.

Our survey shows that the reductions in numbers of clients served by CBOs have been much smaller than the reductions in funding which they suffered. Thus, for example, while 58% of the organizations responding to our survey reported reductions in total agency budgets since 1980, the following patterns emerged:

- Only 40% served fewer out of school youth
- Only 30% served fewer Black or Hispanic youth, and
- Only 22% served fewer young people with limited English-speaking ability

It is easier to report this pattern than to interpret it. It is clear that the elimination of stipends and cutbacks in supportive services and work experience have resulted in CBOs spending less money for each youth that they serve. Are they maintaining the quality of their services by tightening their belts and becoming more efficient? Or are they watering down their product and decreasing its effectiveness? Only time will tell.

(5) What problems are CBOs facing today?

The CBOs responding to our survey reported a wide variety of problems that they face in their efforts to provide employment and training services to disadvantaged youth.

The most frequent problem by far was the limits on administrative monies imposed by law under JTPA. More than half of the responding CBOs mentioned this problem.

The second most frequently cited problem was the limitation in stipends under JTPA. Presumably, the elimination of stipends has hampered the ability of these groups to serve those with no sources of income.

Meeting SDA performance standards while still serving large numbers of disadvantaged youth was the third most frequently cited problem. Nearly half of the CBOs we contacted said that JTPA performance standards were forcing them to serve people with more skills and fewer barriers to employment than they would prefer to serve.

As will be discussed in Elton Jolly's paper later this morning, it is one of the greatest ironies of CETA and JTPA that the well-meaning attempts to promote efficiency by promulgating performance standards have had the effect of luring CBOs to move away from serving the constituencies they were created to serve and thus to abandon the competitive advantage that they hold over other service deliverers.

Cash flow and other financial problems were the fourth most frequently cited problems. These and other administrative problems will receive considerable attention in Larry Brown's this afternoon.

To summarize, CBOs report that they are being hit from at least three different directions:

- Public funding for employment and training programs continues to be cut;
- Within those programs, funding for program administration is being severely limited; and
- Changes in employment and training program regulations make it both harder and less desirable to serve the most disadvantaged.

(6) What kinds of technical assistance are CBOs getting to help them to deal with these problems?

Very little. Only one in every four CBOs who cited problems with meeting SDA performance standards says that it is getting help from a national, statewide, or regional organizations to help to deal with them.

Only one in every eight CBOs who cited problems with limited administrative monies is currently receiving help from outside organizations in dealing with them.

Fewer than one in every twelve CBOs who reported problems with the elimination of stipends is receiving help from outside organizations in helping them to deal with them.

Moreover, it appears as if things are getting worse rather than better in this regard. The transition to JTPA has meant curtailment of many of the nationally funded technical assistance efforts, and the survey results show the effects of this.

Nearly half of all CBOs report that they have faced moderate or severe setbacks in their ability to compete for funds as a result of cutbacks in technical assistance from outside agencies. Many of the others may have never received adequate technical assistance in the first place.

(7) How has the transition to JTPA affected CBO access to information and input into the SDA planning process?

The picture is mixed. Roughly a quarter of the responding CBOs report that they are currently having problems with getting information about JTPA policy in general, and SDA plans and requirements in particular. Nearly half of those who report having this problem report that lack of information and/or access is one of the two or three greatest problems that they are now facing.

Most CBOs report that their access to information about JTPA and access into planning has stayed about the same since the end of CETA, but more than a third report that things are worse off.

Moreover, the proportion of CBOs represented on Prime Sponsor or SDA planning bodies has gone down from roughly a half to roughly a third as a result of the transition to JTPA.

(8) How has the shift to JTPA affected SDA priorities?

Other studies that we will hear about this morning will shed more light on this topic, but as CBOs see it, a mixed picture is emerging.

Nearly half of the CBOs who offered opinions believe that their SDA's priorities for serving disadvantaged youth and out of school youth are lower than the priorities expressed by the CETA Prime Sponsors that they replaced. Most of the others feel the priorities have remained the same, although roughly one in six believe that priority for serving these two groups is going up.

(9) Where do we go from here?

As I understand it, the purpose of today's session is not to listen to research for its own sake, but to consider the steps which CBOs can take individually and collectively in order to make sure that they and their clients get a fair shake.

Of course, one cannot develop prescriptions until one is sure that an illness is indeed present and that it has been properly diagnosed.

Is an illness present? The cutbacks in funding for CBOs and hence their ability to serve disadvantaged youth would only be a problem if they resulted in hardships for the disadvantaged youth whom CBOs purport to serve. Since JTPA is only just now beginning to terminate its first participants, it is impossible to say for sure that service to disadvantaged youth has declined.

However, given the track record that CBOs developed under CETA, it is hard to believe that the cutbacks in funding for CBOs and the redirection of employment and training programs represented by the transition to JTPA will not be shown to have resulted in cutbacks in the numbers of disadvantaged youth served and the quality of the services that they receive.

Therefore, the National Youth Employment Coalition Survey of CBOs has not only outlined the symptoms of a problem, but also provided a few clues toward at least some of the directions CBOS ought to be moving in.

When CBOs were asked to summarize the reasons why they were told they were receiving cutbacks in funding over the past four years, the most frequent reasons given--by far--was the cutbacks in federally funded employment and training programs.

If that's the problem, it is not too difficult to imagine the general directions which a solution might take--increased funding for employment and training programs, especially programs that are targetted on disadvantaged youth.

Although the point may seem obvious, I don't think it can be said often enough. Throughout the CETA years, there was a danger that CBOs would find themselves fighting over a fixed share of the pie, or rehearsing their relative advantages over other potential service deliverers for a given contract. In the recent past, the accelerating cutbacks in employment and training funding have increased the incentives to fall into this trap.

My only point is that there is a continued need for CBOs to join together into coalitions like this one, and for the National Youth Employment Coalition to work with like-minded people to try to build a consensus behind the need for a greater national commitment of resources to addressing the problems of youth unemployment.

Given a major increase in such targetted funding and the previous track record of CBOs, it seems highly likely that SDAs seeking demonstrated effectiveness will turn to community groups as one of their deliverers of choice.

A second sort of issue emerges from the survey finding

that more than a quarter of the CBOs who had received CETA funding didn't even apply to SDAs for funding under JTPA.

Why didn't they? The most frequently cited reason given was that they didn't think they had a chance to be funded. Other reasons included shortcomings in JTPA in meeting the needs of disadvantaged youth, difficulty in meeting performance or cost standards, and lack of knowledge, time and resources needed to put together an acceptable proposal.

Given these diagnoses, the next steps also seem clear. If the rules of the game are making it difficult for organizations serving disadvantaged youth to compete, efforts must be undertaken to change the rules--and I'm sure we'll spend alot of time here today talking about ways in which this can be done.

If CBOs need more help in preparing proposals, national organizations of CBOs and other groups must be adequately funded to help them.

Lastly, the results of the survey seem to reveal mixed, rather than clear cut trends in funding for CBOs. Some community based organizations seem to be growing, while others being cut back sharply. Some are having problems in in administering employment and training programs while others do not.

Two future directions emerge from this conclusion. First, that the CBOs who appear to be prospering in the era of cutbacks probably have lessons to teach others--or at least interesting stories to tell. How is it that they have been able to overcome the barriers faced by everyone else? It seems to me that forums like those provided by national CBOs and the National Youth Employment Coalition are precisely the places where such sharing of experiences might best take place.

Finally, if better service to disadvantaged youth is going to require changes at the federal, state, and SDA levels, there is a need for CBOs to fight the tendency to view others as competitors and to use organizations like the Coalition as an instrument to develop united fronts to push for these changes. Those CBOs who have been able to overcome the funding challenges have evidently won the respect and trust of the wider community, and are therefore precisely the ones who can play leading roles in coalition efforts to influence federal, state, and local decision-makers to raise the priorities to serve disadvantaged youth and to make it easier for CBOs to continue and build upon their past successes in meeting these needs.

# HIGHLIGHTS OF THE FINDINGS
# OF THE
# NATIONAL YOUTH EMPLOYMENT COALITION
# SURVEY OF COMMUNITY BASED ORGANIZATIONS

June 5, 1984

Prepared for:

National Youth Employment Coalition

Prepared by:

Lawrence Neil Bailis
70 Leicester Road
Belmont, Massachusetts 01278

Exhibit 1

TRENDS IN SERVICE DELIVERY*

(All CBOs)

| | Current Level (First year of JTFA) | Last Year of CETA (FY 83) | Four Years Ago (FY 80) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total agency budget for everything | $ 1229 (216)** | 1179 (211) | 1290 (188) |
| Total agency budget for employment and training | 386 (187) | 504 (178) | 691 (162) |
| Total agency budget for employment and training for disadvantaged youth | 219 (170) | 243 (165) | 342 (142) |
| Total agency budget for employment and training for disadvantaged youth from CETA or JTPA | 140 (162) | 233 (164) | 331 (139) |
| Number of disadvantaged youth served | 389 (179) | 370 (186) | 394 (153) |
| Total number of agency staff responsible for training disadvantaged youth | 11.15 (182) | 10.20 (184) | 18.74 (150) |

* Entries represent mean responses for each item. Entries for the first four categories are in thousands of dollars

** Entries in parentheses represent the number of CBOs providing usable data on this item.

Exhibit 2

TRENDS IN SERVICE DELIVERY*

(CBOs created in 1964 or later)

| | Current Level (First year of JTPA) | Last Year of CETA (FY 83) | Four Years Ago (FY 80) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total agency budget for everything | $ 697 | 736 | 1059 |
| Total agency budget for employment and training | 395 | 505 | 800 |
| Total agency budget for employment and training for disadvantaged youth | 195 | 223 | 379 |
| Total agency budget for employment and training for disadvantaged youth from CETA or JTPA | 135 | 252 | 359 |
| Number of disadvantaged youth served | 332 | 326 | 361 |
| Total number of agency staff responsible for training disadvantaged youth | 11.22 | 11.67 | 22.96 |

* Entries represent mean responses for each item. Entries for the first four categories are in thousands of dollars

Exhibit 3

TRENDS IN SERVICE DELIVERY*

(CBOs created prior to 1964)

| | Current Level (First year of JTPA) | Last Year of CETA (FY 83) | Four Years Ago (FY 80) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total agency budget for everything | $ 2563 | 2172 | 1701 |
| Total agency budget for employment and training | 345 | 511 | 453 |
| Total agency budget for employment and training for disadvantaged youth | 289 | 302 | 250 |
| Total agency budget for employment and training for disadvantaged youth from CETA or JTPA | 156 | 195 | 273 |
| Number of disadvantaged youth served | 530 | 472 | 451 |
| Total number of agency staff responsible for training disadvantaged youth | 11.08 | 6.77 | 8.39 |

* Entries represent mean responses for each item. Entries for the first four categories are in thousands of dollars

Exhibit 4

CURRENT PROBLEMS*

(All CBOs)

| | Currently a Problem | Currently One of Two or Three Biggest Problems | Currently Getting Help with Problem |
|---|---|---|---|
| Difficulty in getting information about JTPA policy | 75 | 34 | 56 |
| Difficulty in getting information about SDA plans and policy | 85 | 37 | 43 |
| Meeting SDA performance standards while serving large numbers of disadvantaged youth | 124 | 44 | 33 |
| Limits on administrative monies | 178 | 75 | 22 |
| Elimination of stipends | 139 | 61 | 12 |
| Cash flow | 106 | 60 | 19 |
| Inability to meet SDA record-keeping/financial standards | 15 | 2 | 14 |
| Other financial problems | 66 | 11 | 14 |
| Relationships with PIC | 63 | 27 | 20 |
| Developing ways to approach and work with employers | 58 | 10 | 24 |
| Developing ways of utilizing computer-based instruction | 63 | 7 | 13 |
| Obtaining or operating performance based contracts | 85 | 22 | 18 |
| Other | 23 | 18 | 4 |

* Entries represent the total number of CBOs providing the response.

Exhibit 5

TYPE OF SERVICES DELIVERED*

(All CBOs)

| | Agency Used to Provide But Doesn't Anymore | Agency Still Provides |
|---|---|---|
| Comprehensive (everything from intake to placement) | 14 | 69 |
| Outreach | 18 | 74 |
| Intake and elig. determination | 16 | 58 |
| Assessment | 17 | 69 |
| Classroom skills training | 16 | 63 |
| Remedial education | 20 | 54 |
| English as a Second Language | 11 | 29 |
| Prevocational training | 15 | 51 |
| OJT | 24 | 46 |
| Summer work experience | 20 | 55 |
| Year round work experience for in-school youth | 28 | 26 |
| Year round work experience for out of school youth | 38 | 29 |
| Vocational exploration | 18 | 52 |
| Counselling | 10 | 86 |
| Other supportive services | 8 | 83 |
| Job development | 7 | 89 |
| Job placement or job search assistance (Job Club) | 7 | 77 |
| Other | 1 | 9 |

* Entries represent the total number of CBOs providing the response.